

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed January 9, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 were pending and rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41. No claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claim has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In item 2 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by BEA (Product Family Overview, July 2, 2001, pages 1-24).

BEA is directed to a campaign manager having a family of products that enable a person to efficiently build, launch, and maintain high performance e-business sites (see BEA, page 1, paragraph 1).

According to the "Content Retrieval and Content Management" section in BEA, a business analyst can use a content selector to *specify* what information is shown to a customer based on a criteria (see BEA, page 15). However, such a content selector does not constitute "storing the contribution in said reference information storage part" because the content selector described in BEA is merely concerned with defining what is shown to a customer, whereas claim 1 requires receiving a "*contribution from the customer*" and "*storing the contribution*" in said reference information storage part. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, "receiving ... and storing the contribution" as recited in claim 1 and the "content selector" described in BEA are not the same.

Further, BEA describes, under the "What is Personalization?" Section, that:

Personalization is the means by which Web content developers can tailor an application to a particular individual or group based on any number of criteria.

The criteria can be predefined user attributes such as age and gender, or can be based on behavior information gathered as the user navigates a site

(see BEA, page 14). Stated another way, BEA describes creating applications based on a user personal information or their behavior when using the site.

However, BEA cannot teach or suggest "receiving a contribution from the user", as required by claim 1, because in BEA the user's personal information is collected in such a manner that the user does not positively cooperate on the collection of the user's personal

information, but rather the user merely admits to or allows the collection of the user's personal information. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, BEA fails to teach or suggest "receiving a contribution from the user".

Also the "What is Personalization?" Section in BEA describes that:

Using WebLogic Personalization Server, you can build Java-based Internet pages and a site with dynamic, personalized document content. You can customize what content gets delivered based on individual user profiles

(see BEA, page 14). Stated another way, BEA describes customizing the content to be delivered based on the user profiles.

However, claim 1 requires "defining a range of the reference information ... for the user to refer to". BEA does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature because BEA is merely concerned with customizing content rather than "defining a range of the reference information ... for the user to refer" to as required by claim 1. Thus, BEA teaches away from claim 1.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, claim 1 is patentable over BEA.

Further, independent claims 9, 17 and 33 emphasize similar features as claim 1. Thus, claims 9, 17 and 33 are patentable over BEA for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 41 recites "making accessible a range of information that is less than all of the information and meeting the applied information management rule so as to define and make available a range of information that is suitable for each user; and receiving and storing a contribution from a user". Therefore, it is submitted that claim 41 is patentable over BEA for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-32 and 35-40 are also patentable over BEA for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, from which they depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/788,486

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 9, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/  
Sheetal S. Patel  
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501